IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 586 OF 2004
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1232 OF 2004

Pratiba Naitthani] .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Union of India & Ors.] .. Respondents

And

Mr. Bipin B. Dhotre.] .. Applicant

Mr. M.M. Vashi for the petitioner.

Ms. Mausam Mody i/b Anil Menon for the respondent No.4.

Mr. B.A. Desai with Rajiv Chavan & D.A. Dubey i/b Dr. T.C. Kaushik for Union of India.

Mr. P.M. Mokashi, AGP, for respondent No.2-State.

Mr. Ranjit Shetty i/b M/s. PDS Legal for respondent No.5.

Mr. D.J. Khambatta with Mr. H.N. Thakore i/b M/s. Thakore Jariwala & Associates for applicant in Notice of Motion no.22 of 2006.

Dr. Virendra Tulzapurkar, senior counsel with Mr. S.U. Kadam i/b Kadam & Co. for respondents No.3 & 7.

Mr. Virag Tulzapurkar with Mr. H.C. Chaturvedi i/b M/s. Chaturvedi & Associates for applicant in Notice of Motion No.21 of 2006.

Mr. P. James i/b Mr. A.M. Vernekar for respondents No.8 & 9.

CORAM: R.M. LODHA &
A.S. BAGGA, JJ.

DATED: 21ST JUNE, 2006

P.C. :

. The Writ Petition is in the nature of Public Interest Litigation and, therefore, we find no justification in permitting the applicant to be impleaded as party-respondent. However, if at the time of hearing of the Writ Petition, the assitance by the applicant is found be of some importance, he may be permitted to assist the Court in the matter.

2. The prayer for interim relief does not survive by lapse of time.

3. Notice of Motion stands disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
[R.M. LODHA, J.]

Sd/-
[A.S. BAGGA, J.]